

REMARKS

By this Amendment, Applicants amend claims 1, 4, 5, 16, and 18, cancel claim 10, and add claims 19-23. Accordingly, claims 1-9 and 12-23 are pending in this application.

Applicants appreciate the courtesies extended to Applicants' representative during the June 1, 2004 personal interview. Applicants incorporate a separate record of the personal interview into the following remarks.

Applicants gratefully acknowledge Examiner Bui 's indication that claims 4-10 and 12-15 would be allowable if the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, is overcome. However, Applicants submit that each of claims 1-9 and 12-18 are allowable for at least the following reasons.

The Office Action rejects claims 4-10 and 12-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

The Office action alleges that claims 4-10 and 12-15 are indefinite because claim 4 fails to define the relationship between the media discharge port and the object. As discussed during the personal interview, such an assertion, if true, would only support a rejection of claim 4 and claims 5-8, depending from claim 4. During the personal interview, Examiner Bui agreed that the rejection of claims 9, 10, and 12-15 was an oversight. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 9, 10, and 12-15.

Applicants amend claim 4 to recite "a standoff sensor that is associated with the actuator and maintains a predetermined distance between the media discharge port and an object to which media is discharged." Therefore, as discussed during the personal interview, it is clear that the recited object is the object to which media is discharged rather than an object that is part of the device. During the personal interview, Examiner Bui agreed that such an amendment would overcome the rejection of claims 4-8. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 4-8 be withdrawn.

Applicants submit that the above-described feature of amended claim 4 was inherent in the language of previous claim 4. For example, it is abundantly clear in light of the specification that the "object" is the object that the media is discharged towards (paragraphs [0022] - [0030] and Figs. 4 and 5). However, in an effort to clarify the claim language, Applicants amend claim 4 to explicitly incorporate this implicit feature. As a result, the Amendment merely clarifies claim 4 and does not narrow the claim.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-3, 16, and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over U.S. Patent 4,875,562 to Latino et al. (hereinafter "Latino"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

As discussed and agreed to during the personal interview, this rejection has been rendered moot by the incorporation of the features of allowable claim 10 into claims 1 and 16. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

The Office Action rejects claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over U.S. Patent 3,744,719 to Wallick et al. (hereinafter "Wallick"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Applicants amend claim 18 to recite that the telescoping device is supported at only a single point. As discussed and agreed to during the personal interview, the portable liquid spray assembly disclosed in Wallick is supported at multiple points. Therefore, Wallick cannot be considered to disclose, teach, or suggest that the telescoping device is supported at only a single point. As noted during the personal interview, the fact that Wallick does not disclose, teach, or suggest that the telescoping device is supported at only a single point is supported by the Office Action's failure to include claim 16 in the present rejection. As a result, as agreed during the personal interview claim 18 is patentable over Latino. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Finally, as discussed during the personal interview, Applicants add new claims 19-23 which substantially correspond to previously pending claims 1-3, 16, and 17 with the added allowable feature of claim 12. Thus, as agreed during the personal interview, new claims 19-23 are allowable at least for the same reasons as allowable claim 12. Support for the new claims may be found in previously pending claims 1-3, 12, 16, and 17.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Applicants earnestly solicit favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-9 and 12-23.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, Applicants invite Examiner Bui to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Jesse O. Collier
Registration No. 53,839

JAO:JOC/tea

Date: June 4, 2004

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461
--